

DETAILED ACTION

1. In the last Office Action, some extraneous comments were printed. This Supplemental Notice of Allowance corrects the inadvertent printing of such comments. The previous office action dated 12/29/08 is hereby withdrawn and replaced with the current office action.
2. The amendment filed 8/6/2008 has been received and considered. Claim 70 is cancelled via Examiner's Amendment. Claims 1–69 and 71–75 are presented for examination.

Examiner's Amendment

3. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
4. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mr. Sahota on 12/16/08.
5. The application has been amended as follows:
6. Claim 24 line 2, the term "said database" has been replaced with the term -- said digital definition --.
7. Claim 58 line 2, the term "said database" has been replaced with the term -- said digital definition --.

Art Unit: 2123

8. Claim 61 lines 1–2, the term “medium comprising code capable of instructing a computer to perform a method” has been replaced with the term --medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method--.
9. Claim 70 has been canceled via examiner’s amendment.
10. Claim 71 line 1, the term “comprising of” has been replaced with the word --comprising--.
11. Claim 72 line 1, the term “comprising of” has been replaced with the word --comprising--.
12. Claim 73 line 1, the term “comprising of” has been replaced with the word --comprising--.
13. Claim 74 line 1, the term “comprising of” has been replaced with the word --comprising--.
14. Claim 61, has been amended to overcome 101 issues.
15. Claim 70 has been canceled to overcome 112 issues.
16. Examiner notes that claims 24, 58, and 71–74 are currently amended to bring the claim language in conformity with that of the base claims from which claims 24, 58, and 71–74 depend.

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 1–69 and 71–75 are allowed over prior art of record.
18. Claims 1–9, 18–26, 35–43, 52–60, 69, and 71–74 are allowed over prior art of record for the “means for” language, which the Examiner interprets as in the description

of the instant application paragraphs [0028, 0029 and 0031], in light of the arguments filed 8/6/2008, (see page 18, 5th paragraph), wherein Applicant invokes 112 sixth paragraph.

19. As to claims 10–17, 27–34, 44–51, 61–68, and 75 the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

20. While Noma, Pre–Grant publication 20040010398 (see PTO-892 Notice of Reference Cited dated 3/12/07), discloses whether a second change to the interior section of the passenger vehicle is necessary because of the first change to the interior section of the passenger vehicle (see “the program receives user's inputs using the pointing device, determines a portion and its deformation contents designated by an input command, and changes coordinate data in accordance with the command” in paragraph [0206]), and e) executing the second change to the interior section of the passenger vehicle by updating said digital definition (see Fig. 26, item Nos. S14, S15, and S17),

Lohmann, Pre–Grant publication 20020026296 (see PTO-892 Notice of Reference Cited dated 3/12/07), discloses a method further comprising of fully automating the arranging of interior objects while checking clearances and certification requirements for the entire interior whenever a change is made (see paragraph [0032]),

Weber, U.S. Patent 6,113,644 (see PTO-892 Notice of Reference Cited dated 3/12/07), discloses a system further comprising of a means for zones being arranged in a

Art Unit: 2123

hierarchy wherein each zone represents a smaller portion of the vehicle, and there is at least one or more smaller zones inside a larger zone (see col. 6, lines 10–21),

Robert Brauer, U.S. Patent 5,611,503. (See PTO-892 Notice of Reference Cited dated 3/12/07),

Brauer, U.S. Patent 5,611,503. (See PTO-892 Notice of Reference Cited dated 3/12/07), discloses a system further comprising a means for determining the maximum number of seats that can fit in a section of the interior/configurable space, based on said parameters and the location of other objects in the interior (see claim 13),

none of these references taken either alone or in combination and in the same relationship with the prior art of record disclose a design of an interior section of a passenger vehicle specifically including:

claim 10 "fully automating the arranging of interior section of the passenger vehicle while checking clearances and certification requirements for the entire interior whenever a change is made",

claim 27 "fully automating the arranging of all digital definitions of the interior objects in the interior section while checking clearances and certification requirements for the entire interior whenever a change is made, and zones being arranged in a hierarchy wherein each zone represents a smaller portion of the vehicle, and there is at least one or more smaller zones inside a larger zone",

claim 44 "fully automating the arranging of interior objects while checking clearances and certification requirements for the entire interior whenever a change is made",

Art Unit: 2123

claim 61 "fully automating the arranging of interior objects while checking clearances and certification requirements for the entire interior whenever a change is made, an object placing sequence including every object in the system having a zone that defines the boundaries within which it can be placed, accommodating full automation", which the Examiner interprets as "a Knowledge Based Interior Development tool that enhances and automates the process for developing interior configurations" (see description of the instant application paragraph [0022]); "The Knowledge Based Interior Development tool enables the users to easily and efficiently access and share geometry and parameter data for the development of interior designs while consistently checking and assuring compliance with certification regulations" (see description of the instant application paragraph [0023]); "Because all of the components are inter-related through zones and awareness of boundaries, the update is completed automatically. Following the example above, if the configurator reduces the recline distance of the seats in the last row by one inch, enough space may be freed up behind that row to insert another row of seats. The system knows this because the code is programmed to insert rows of seats behind other rows of seats if another monument (or the aft bulkhead) is not in the way. Thus, by changing the attributes of one row of seats, another row of seats is added automatically" (see description of the instant application paragraph [0038]); and "Because of the automated nature of the system, updates can be concluded in a much shorter amount of time than was previously possible. This allows for live configuration during a demonstration to a customer, which was impractical with longer configuration times" (see description of the instant application paragraph [0047]) specifically argued

Art Unit: 2123

as "the specification shows that the arranging of the interior section of vehicle and checking of clearances and certifications are automatically done without manual input, such as impractical long configuration times, thereby being fully automatic" (see Applicant's arguments filed 8/6/2008 page 19, 2nd paragraph) and "The specification of Lohman states that configuration is automated, but it does not teach or suggest that the entire interior is affected as in the present claimed invention. Lohman fails to take into account and is not capable of processing the variables of all the interior changes as seen in the present invention, but rather only looks at certain ones" (see Applicant's arguments filed 8/6/2008 page 21, 1st paragraph), in combination with and in the same relationship with the remaining elements and features of the claimed invention. Also, there is no motivation to combine these references to meet these limitations. It is for these reasons that applicant's invention defines over the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 8/6/2008 have been fully considered, and they are persuasive.

Conclusion

22. Examiner would like to point out that any reference to specific figures, columns and lines should not be considered limiting in any way, the entire reference is considered to provide disclosure relating to the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2123

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Juan C. Ochoa whose telephone number is (571) 272-2625. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00 PM.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. C. O./ 2/2/09

Examiner, Art Unit 2123

/Paul L Rodriguez/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123